

Non-integrability of open billiard flows and Dolgopyat type estimates

LUCHEZAR STOYANOV

University of Western Australia, Crawley WA 6009, Australia

(e-mail: stoyanov@maths.uwa.edu.au)

Abstract. We consider open billiard flows in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and show that the standard symplectic form $d\alpha$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies a specific non-integrability condition over their non-wandering sets Λ . This allows to use the main result in [St3] and obtain Dolgopyat type estimates for spectra of Ruelle transfer operators under simpler conditions. We also describe a class of open billiard flows in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 3$) satisfying a certain pinching condition, which in turn implies that the (un)stable laminations over the non-wandering set are C^1 .

1 Introduction

It is well-known that hyperbolic billiard flows in compact domains (e.g. Sinai billiards in Euclidean spaces or on tori) are non-integrable, just like contact Anosov flows (see e.g. [KB] or Appendix B in [L]). However, when considering contact flows over basic sets Λ the general non-degeneracy of the contact form (which implies the non-integrability) does not say much about the dynamics of the flow over Λ . It is much more natural, and it turns out to be important as well, to look at the restriction of the contact form over tangent vectors to Λ (see Sect. 2 for the definition). This is what we do here for non-wandering sets of open billiard flows. The motivation to study this kind of non-integrability comes from [St3] which deals with spectral estimates of Ruelle transfer operators for flows on basic sets (see Sect. 6 below for some details).

Let K be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$) of the form $K = K_1 \cup K_2 \cup \dots \cup K_{k_0}$, where K_i are compact strictly convex disjoint domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with C^2 boundaries $\Gamma_i = \partial K_i$ and $k_0 \geq 3$. Set $\Omega = \overline{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K}$ and $\Gamma = \partial K$. We assume that K satisfies the following (no-eclipse) condition:

$$(H) \quad \begin{cases} \text{for every pair } K_i, K_j \text{ of different connected components of } K \text{ the convex hull of} \\ K_i \cup K_j \text{ has no common points with any other connected component of } K. \end{cases}$$

With this condition, the *billiard flow* ϕ_t defined on the *sphere bundle* $S(\Omega)$ in the standard way is called an *open billiard flow*. It has singularities, however its restriction to the *non-wandering set* Λ has only simple discontinuities at reflection points. Moreover, Λ is compact, ϕ_t is hyperbolic and transitive on Λ , and it follows from [St1] that ϕ_t is non-lattice and therefore by a result of Bowen [B], it is topologically weak-mixing on Λ .

Our main aim in this paper is to show that the open billiard flow always satisfies a certain non-integrability condition on Λ . Let $d\alpha$ be the *standard symplectic form* on $T(\mathbb{R}^n) = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

THEOREM 1.1. *There exist $z_0 \in \Lambda$ and $\mu > 0$ such that for any unit tangent vector $b \in E^u(z_0)$ to Λ there exists a unit tangent vector $a \in E^s(z_0)$ to Λ with $|d\alpha(a, b)| \geq \mu$.*

If the map $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^u(x)$ is C^1 , then the invariance of $d\alpha$ along the flow implies that the points $z_0 \in \Lambda$ with the above property form an open and dense subset of Λ . Theorem 1.1 is established by means of a certain pairing of points on the strong stable and unstable manifolds of an appropriately chosen point z_0 - see Sect. 3 and Lemma 3.1 there for details. As a consequence

of this and the main result in [St3] one gets Dolgopyat type spectral estimates for pinched open billiard flows – see Sect. 6.

It is well-known that in general the maps $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^u(x)$ (or $E^s(x)$) are only Hölder continuous (see e.g [HPS] or [PSW]). The following *pinching condition* implies stronger regularity properties of these maps.

(P): *There exist constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ such that for every $x \in \Lambda$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{C} e^{\alpha_x t} \|u\| \leq \|d\phi_t(x) \cdot u\| \leq C e^{\beta_x t} \|u\| \quad , \quad u \in E^u(x) \quad , t > 0 \quad ,$$

for some constants $\alpha_x, \beta_x > 0$ depending on x but independent of u and t with $\alpha \leq \alpha_x \leq \beta_x \leq \beta$ and $2\alpha_x - \beta_x \geq \alpha$ for all $x \in \Lambda$.

For example in the case of contact flows ϕ_t , it follows from the results in [Ha2] (see also [Ha1]) that assuming (P), the map $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^u(x)$ is $C^{1+\epsilon}$ with $\epsilon = 2\alpha/\beta - 1 > 0$ (in the sense that this map has a linearization at any $x \in \Lambda$ that depends Hölder continuously on x). The same applies to the map $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^s(x)$.

Notice that when $n = 2$ (then the local unstable manifolds are one-dimensional) this condition is always satisfied. It turns out that for $n \geq 3$ the condition (P) is always satisfied when the minimal distance between distinct connected components of K is relatively large compared to the maximal sectional curvature of ∂K (see Proposition 1.2 below). An analogue of the latter for manifolds M of strictly negative curvature would be to require that the sectional curvature is between $-K_0$ and $-a K_0$ for some constants $K_0 > 0$ and $a \in (0, 1)$. It follows from the arguments in [HP] that when $a = 1/4$ the geodesic flow on M satisfies the pinching condition (P).

Set $d_{i,j} = \text{dist}(K_i, K_j)$ and $d_0 = \min_{i \neq j} d_{i,j}$. Since every K_i is strictly convex, the operator $L_x : T_x(\partial K) \rightarrow T_x(\partial K)$, $L_x u = (\nabla_u \nu)(x)$, of the *second fundamental form* is positive definite with respect to the outward unit normal field $\nu(y)$, $y \in \partial K$. Then $k(x, u) = \langle L_x u, u \rangle$ is the *normal curvature* of ∂K at x in the direction of $u \in T_x(\partial K)$, $\|u\| = 1$. Set

$$\kappa_{\min} = \min_{x \in \partial K} \min_{u \in T_x(\partial K), \|u\|=1} \langle L_x(u), u \rangle \quad , \quad \kappa_{\max} = \max_{x \in \partial K} \max_{u \in T_x(\partial K), \|u\|=1} \langle L_x(u), u \rangle \quad ,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the *standard inner product* in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Before continuing, notice that the condition (H) implies the existence of a global constant $\varphi_0 \in (0, \pi/2)$ such that for any $x \in \Lambda$ and any reflection point q of the billiard trajectory $\gamma(x)$ generated by x the angle φ between the reflected direction of $\gamma(x)$ at q and the outward normal to ∂K at q satisfies $\varphi \leq \varphi_0$. Set $\mu_0 = 2 \cos \varphi_0 \kappa_{\min}$ and $\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{d_0} + \frac{2 \kappa_{\max}}{\cos \varphi_0}$.

Let $a > 0$ be such that $d_{i,j} \leq d_0 + a$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, k_0$, $i \neq j$. Below we assume that d_0 is large compared to a and $\kappa_{\max}$, so that

$$(1.1) \quad [1 + (d_0 + a) \lambda_0]^{d_0+a} < (1 + d_0 \mu_0)^{2d_0} \quad .$$

(Notice that when $a = r d_0$, $0 < r < 1$, then the above holds for all sufficiently large d_0 , assuming $\kappa_{\max}$ and $\kappa_{\min}$ are uniformly bounded above and below, respectively, by positive constants.)

In Section 5 below we prove the following

PROPOSITION 1.2. *Assume that (1.1) holds and the boundary ∂K is C^3 . Then the open billiard flow ϕ_t in the exterior of K satisfies the condition (P) on its non-wandering set Λ . Moreover, for any $x \in \Lambda$ we can choose $\alpha_x = \alpha_0$ and $\beta_x = \beta_0$, where $\alpha_0 = \frac{\ln(1+d_0 \mu_0)}{d_0+a}$ and $\beta_0 = \frac{\ln(1+(d_0+a) \lambda_0)}{d_0}$.*

This is relatively easy to derive from a formula for the growth of the differential of the flow on unstable manifolds (see Proposition 5.1). The latter can be proved using an argument similar to that in the Appendix in [St2] (dealing with the two-dimensional case), and also can be easily derived from more general facts about the evolution of unstable vectors for multidimensional dispersing billiards (see e.g. [BCST]).

Section 2 below contains some basic definitions and an example which concerns the geometry of the non-wandering set Λ . Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 5 we use some well known formulae of Sinai for curvature operators related to unstable manifolds of dispersing billiards to prove Proposition 1.2. Section 6 deals with Dolgopayt type estimates for pinched open billiard flows – these are straightforward consequences of [St3] and the considerations in Sect. 3 below.

Acknowledgement. The author is grateful to the referee whose comments and criticism led to a significant improvement of the first version of the paper.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basic definitions

Let M be a C^1 complete Riemann manifold, and $\phi_t : M \rightarrow M$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) a C^1 flow on M . A ϕ_t -invariant closed subset Λ of M is called *hyperbolic* if Λ contains no fixed points and there exist constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that there exists a $d\phi_t$ -invariant decomposition $T_x M = E^0(x) \oplus E^u(x) \oplus E^s(x)$ of $T_x M$ ($x \in \Lambda$) into a direct sum of non-zero linear subspaces, where $E^0(x)$ is the one-dimensional subspace determined by the direction of the flow at x , $\|d\phi_t(u)\| \leq C \lambda^t \|u\|$ for all $u \in E^s(x)$ and $t \geq 0$, and $\|d\phi_t(u)\| \leq C \lambda^{-t} \|u\|$ for all $u \in E^u(x)$ and $t \leq 0$.

A non-empty compact ϕ_t -invariant hyperbolic subset Λ of M which is not a single closed orbit is called a *basic set* for ϕ_t if ϕ_t is transitive on Λ and Λ is locally maximal, i.e. there exists an open neighbourhood V of Λ in M such that $\Lambda = \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_t(V)$.

For $x \in \Lambda$ and a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ let

$$W_\epsilon^s(x) = \{y \in M : d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } t \geq 0, d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \rightarrow_{t \rightarrow \infty} 0\},$$

$$W_\epsilon^u(x) = \{y \in M : d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } t \leq 0, d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \rightarrow_{t \rightarrow -\infty} 0\}$$

be the (strong) *stable* and *unstable manifolds* of size ϵ . Then $E^u(x) = T_x W_\epsilon^u(x)$ and $E^s(x) = T_x W_\epsilon^s(x)$. Given $z \in \Lambda$, let $\exp_z^u : E^u(z) \rightarrow W_{\epsilon_0}^u(z)$ and $\exp_z^s : E^s(z) \rightarrow W_{\epsilon_0}^s(z)$ be the corresponding *exponential maps*. A vector $b \in E^u(z) \setminus \{0\}$ is called *tangent to Λ at z* if there exist infinite sequences $\{v^{(m)}\} \subset E^u(z)$ and $\{t_m\} \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\exp_z^u(t_m v^{(m)}) \in \Lambda \cap W_\epsilon^u(z)$ for all m , $v^{(m)} \rightarrow b$ and $t_m \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. It is easy to see that a vector $b \in E^u(z) \setminus \{0\}$ is tangent to Λ at z iff there exists a C^1 curve $z(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq a$, in $W_\epsilon^u(z)$ for some $a > 0$ with $z(0) = z$, $\dot{z}(0) = b$, and $z(t_n) \in \Lambda$ for some sequence $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, a]$ with $t_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Tangent vectors to Λ in $E^s(z)$ are defined similarly. Denote by $\hat{E}^u(z)$ (resp. $\hat{E}^s(z)$) the *set of all vectors $b \in E^u(z) \setminus \{0\}$ (resp. $b \in E^s(z) \setminus \{0\}$) tangent to Λ at z* .

Remark 1. Although we have not sought to construct particular examples, it appears that in general the set of unit tangent vectors to Λ does not have to be closed in the bundle E_Λ^u (or E_Λ^s). That is, there may exist a point $z \in \Lambda$, a sequence $\{z_m\} \subset W_\epsilon^u(z) \cap \Lambda$ and for each m a unit vector ξ_m tangent to Λ at z_m such that $z_m \rightarrow z$ and $\xi_m \rightarrow \xi$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, however ξ is not tangent to Λ at z .

Next, assume that K and Ω are as in Sect. 1. The *non-wandering set* Λ for the flow ϕ_t is the set of those $x \in S(\Omega)$ such that the trajectory $\{\phi_t(x) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is bounded. Notice that the natural projection of ϕ_t on the quotient space $S(\Omega)/\sim$, where $\sim$ is the equivalence relation $(q, v) \sim (p, w)$ iff $q = p$ and $v = w$ or $q = p \in \partial K$ and v and w are symmetric with respect to $T_q(\partial K)$, is continuous. Moreover whenever both x and $\phi_t(x)$ are in the interior of $S(\Omega)$ and sufficiently close to Λ , the map $y \mapsto \phi_t(y)$ is smooth on a neighbourhood of x . It follows from results of Sinai ([Si1], [Si2]) that Λ is a hyperbolic set for ϕ_t , and it is easily seen that Λ is the maximal compact ϕ_t -invariant subset of $S(\Omega)$. Moreover, it follows from the natural symbolic coding for the natural section of the flow (the so called billiard ball map) that the periodic points are dense in Λ , and ϕ_t is transitive on Λ . Thus, Λ is a basic set for ϕ_t and the classical theory of hyperbolic flows applies in the case under consideration (see e.g. Part 4 in [KH]).

2.2 An example

Here we briefly describe a (non-trivial) example from [St4] which shows that in general for every $z \in \Lambda$ the space $\text{span}(\widehat{E}_\Lambda^u(z))$ generated by the vectors in $E^u(z)$ tangent to Λ could be a proper subspace of $E^u(z)$.

Example 2.1. ([St4]) Assume that $n = 3$ and there exists a plane α such that each of the domains K_j is symmetric with respect to α . Setting $K' = K \cap \alpha$ and $\Omega' = \Omega \cap \alpha$, it is easy to observe that every billiard trajectory generated by a point in Λ is entirely contained in α . That is, $\Lambda = \Lambda'$, where Λ' is the non-wandering set for the open billiard flow in Ω' . Thus, $\dim(\text{span}(\widehat{E}_\Lambda^u(z))) = 1 < \dim(E^u(z)) = 2$ for any $z \in \Lambda$. This example is of course trivial, since Λ is contained in the flow-invariant submanifold $S^*(\Omega')$ of $S^*(\Omega)$.

However with a small local perturbation of the boundary ∂K of K we can get a non-trivial example. Choosing standard cartesian coordinates x, y, z in $\mathbb{R}^3$, we may assume that α is given by the equation $z = 0$, i.e. $\alpha = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}$. Let $\text{pr}_1 : S^*(\mathbb{R}^3) \sim \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be the natural projection, and let $C = \text{pr}_1(\Lambda)$. We may choose the coordinates x, y in the plane $\alpha = \{z = 0\}$ so that the line $y = 0$ is tangent to K'_1 and K'_2 and K' is contained in the half-plane $y \geq 0$. Let $q_1 \in K'_1$ and $q_2 \in K'_2$ be such that $[q_1, q_2]$ is the shortest segment connecting K'_1 and K'_2 . Take a point $q'_1 \in \partial K'_1$ close to q_1 and such that the y -coordinate of y'_1 is smaller than that of q_1 . Consider the *open arc* $\mathcal{A}$ on $\partial K'_1$ connecting q_1 and q'_1 . It is clear that $\mathcal{A} \cap C = \emptyset$.

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a C^1 (we can make it even C^∞) diffeomorphism with $f(x) = x$ for all x outside a small open set U such that $q_1 \in \overline{U}$ and $U \cap \partial K' \subset \mathcal{A}$. Then for any $q \in C$ the tangent planes $T_q(\partial K)$ and $T_q(\partial \tilde{K})$ coincide. We can choose f so that $\tilde{K}_i = f(K_i) = K_i$ for $i > 1$, $\tilde{K}_1 = f(K_1)$ is strictly convex, and $\tilde{\nu}(f(q)) \notin \alpha$ for $q \in \mathcal{A}$ arbitrarily close to q_1 . Here $\tilde{\nu}$ is the outward unit normal field to $\partial \tilde{K}$.

One can then show that the non-wandering set $\tilde{\Lambda}$ for the billiard flow $\tilde{\phi}_t$ in the closure $\tilde{\Omega}$ of the exterior of $\tilde{K}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ coincides with Λ ([St4]). Thus, $\dim(\text{span}(\widehat{E}_\Lambda^u(z))) = 1 < \dim(E^u(z))$ for any $z \in \tilde{\Lambda}$. However, it is clear from the construction that $S^*(\alpha \cap \Omega)$ is not invariant with respect to the billiard flow $\tilde{\phi}_t$. Moreover, it is not difficult to see that there is no two-dimensional submanifold $\tilde{\alpha}$ of $\tilde{\Omega}$ such that $S^*(\tilde{\alpha})$ is $d\tilde{\phi}_t$ -invariant and $\Lambda \subset S^*(\tilde{\alpha})$; see Section 4 in [St4] for details.

3 Non-integrability of open billiard flows

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1.

Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be as in Sect. 1. For any $x \in \Gamma = \partial K$ we will denote by $\nu(x)$ the *outward unit normal* to Γ at x . Given $\delta > 0$ denote by $S_\delta(\Omega)$ the set of those $(x, u) \in S(\Omega)$ such that there exist $y \in \Gamma$ and $t \geq 0$ with $y + tu = x$, $y + su \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ for all $s \in (0, t)$ and $\langle u, \nu_\Gamma(y) \rangle \geq \delta$.

Remark 2. Notice that the condition (H) implies the existence of a constant $\delta_0 > 0$ depending only on the obstacle K such that any $(x, u) \in S(\Omega)$ whose backward and forward billiard trajectories both have a common point with Γ belongs to $S_{\delta_0}(\Omega)$.

For $\epsilon \in (0, d_0/2)$ set

$$\mathcal{D}_\epsilon(\Omega) = \{x = (q, v) \in S(\Omega) : \text{dist}(q, \partial K) > \epsilon\} \quad , \quad \Lambda_\epsilon = \Lambda \cap \mathcal{D}_\epsilon(\Omega) .$$

In what follows in order to avoid ambiguity and unnecessary complications we will consider stable and unstable manifolds only for points x in $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon(\Omega)$ or Λ_ϵ ; this will be enough for our purposes.

Fix for a moment arbitrary ϵ, δ and λ so that

$$(3.1) \quad 0 < \delta \leq \epsilon < \lambda < \frac{d_0}{2} .$$

We will see later how small these numbers need to be.

Consider an arbitrary point $\sigma_0 = (x^{(0)}, \xi^{(0)}) \in \Lambda_\epsilon$ such that $z^{(0)} = x^{(0)} + \lambda \xi^{(0)} \in \partial K$, $\xi^{(0)} = -\nu(z^{(0)})$ and $x^{(0)} + t \xi^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ for all $t \in [0, \lambda)$. I.e. the billiard trajectory generated by σ_0 is perpendicular to ∂K at $z^{(0)}$ and so the reflected direction at $z^{(0)}$ is $-\xi^{(0)}$. Notice that there exist such points¹, e.g. we can take $x^{(0)}$ on the shortest segment between two connected components K_i and K_j ($i \neq j$) with $\xi^{(0)}$ parallel to that segment. The local submanifolds $U = W_\delta^u(\sigma_0)$ and $S = W_\epsilon^s(\sigma_0)$ have the form

$$U = \{(x, \nu_X(x)) : x \in X\} \quad , \quad S = \{(y, \nu_Y(y)) : y \in Y\}$$

for some smooth local $(n-1)$ -dimensional submanifolds X and Y in $\mathbb{R}^n$, where ν_X and ν_Y are continuous unit normal fields on X and Y . Moreover the *second fundamental form* $L^{(X)}$ of X with respect to ν_X (resp. $L^{(Y)}$ of Y with respect to ν_Y) is positive (resp. negative) definite. Finally, we have $x^{(0)} \in X \cap Y$, X and Y are tangent at $x^{(0)}$ and $\nu_X(x^{(0)}) = \nu_Y(x^{(0)}) = \xi^{(0)}$. Since the tangent planes to X and Y at x_0 are parallel to the tangent plane to ∂K at $z^{(0)}$, we have $T_{x^{(0)}}X = T_{x^{(0)}}Y = T_{z^{(0)}}(\partial K)$.

Consider the *inversion* $i : S(\Omega) \rightarrow S(\Omega)$ defined by $i(x, \xi) = (x, -\xi)$. It follows from the general properties of stable (unstable) manifolds that for any $(x, \xi) \in S$ (or U) sufficiently close to σ_0 we have $i \circ \phi_{2\lambda}(x, \xi) \in U$ (S , respectively). In other words the shift along the billiard flow ϕ_t of the convex front S along the normal field $\nu_Y(y)$ in 2λ units coincides locally with the inversion of the convex front X near $x^{(0)}$. Using Sinai's formula ([Si2], cf. also [SiCh]) in the particular situation considered here we have

$$L_{x^{(0)}}^{(X)}(u) = \frac{B_{x^{(0)}}(u)}{I + \lambda B_{x^{(0)}}(u)} ,$$

where

$$B_{x^{(0)}}(u) = \frac{L_{x^{(0)}}^{(Y)}(u)}{1 + \lambda L_{x^{(0)}}^{(Y)}(u)} + 2L_{z^{(0)}}(u) \quad , \quad u \in T_{x^{(0)}}X .$$

¹In fact, it is not difficult to see that the union of the orbits of such points σ_0 is a dense subset of Λ .

It is well-known (see [Si2]) that the curvature operators of strong unstable manifolds of ϕ_t are uniformly bounded, so there exists a global constant $C > 0$ such that $2L_{z^{(0)}}(u) \leq B_{x^{(0)}}(u) \leq C$ for all $u \in T_{x^{(0)}}X$, $\|u\| \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$(3.2) \quad C' \leq L_{x^{(0)}}^{(X)}(u) \leq C \quad , \quad u \in T_{x^{(0)}}X, \quad \|u\| \leq 1 ,$$

for some other global constant $C' > 0$ (depending on K but not on λ and u).

Consider the map $\Phi : U \rightarrow S$ near $\sigma_0 = (x^{(0)}, \xi^{(0)})$ defined by $\Phi(x, \xi) = i \circ \phi_{2\lambda}(x, \xi)$. In fact by the same formula (see below for more details) one defines Φ as a local smooth map $\Phi : T(\mathbb{R}^n) = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow T(\mathbb{R}^n)$ near σ_0 . Given $\epsilon > 0$, we will assume $\delta \in (0, \epsilon]$ is chosen sufficiently small, so that Φ is well-defined and $\Phi(U) \subset S$. Moreover, $\Phi(z) = z'$ implies $\Phi(z') = z$ (whenever $\Phi(z')$ is defined) and locally $\Phi(W_\epsilon^u(z)) = W_\epsilon^s(z')$. Finally, it is important to remark that Φ preserves the set Λ . Indeed, $\phi_{2\lambda}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ and $i(\Lambda) = \Lambda$, as well. So, in particular

$$(3.3) \quad \Phi(U \cap \Lambda) \subset S \cap \Lambda .$$

To write down a more explicit expression for Φ , let f be a defining function for ∂K in a neighbourhood of ∂K in $\mathbb{R}^n$ so that $\|\nabla f\| = 1$ near $z^{(0)}$ and $\nabla f(z) = \nu(z)$ is the outward unit normal to ∂K at $z \in \partial K$. Then $\partial K = f^{-1}(0)$ (locally near $z^{(0)}$). Given $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ close to σ_0 , there exist a unique $z(x, \xi) \in \partial K$ and a unique minimal $t(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ with $z(x, \xi) = x + t(x, \xi)\xi \in \partial K$, i.e. such that

$$(3.4) \quad f(x + t(x, \xi)\xi) = 0 .$$

By $\eta(x, \xi)$ we denote the reflection of ξ with respect to $\nabla f(z(x, \xi))$, i.e.

$$\eta(x, \xi) = \xi - 2\langle \xi, \nabla f(z) \rangle \nabla f(z) .$$

Here and in what follows we denote for brevity $z = z(x, \xi)$. We will also use the notation $t = t(x, \xi)$ and $\eta = \eta(x, \xi)$. We then have

$$\Phi(x, \xi) = (g(x, \xi), -\eta(x, \xi)) ,$$

where $g(x, \xi) = z + (2\lambda - t)\eta$. Since $\Phi(U) \subset S$ and Φ is a local diffeomorphism between U and S , we have $d\Phi_\sigma(E^u(\sigma)) = E^s(\sigma)$ for every $\sigma \in U$. Moreover, it is easy to see that $d\Phi_\sigma$ preserves the sets of tangent vectors to Λ , namely if $\sigma \in U \cap \Lambda$ and $\xi \in E^u(\sigma) \setminus \{0\}$ is tangent to Λ at σ , then $d\Phi_\sigma \cdot \xi$ is tangent to Λ at $\Phi(\sigma)$.

It is well known that we can take the constant $C > 0$ so large that $\|d\Phi_\sigma\| \leq C$ for any $\sigma \in U$ and any choice of σ_0 (see e.g. [Si2], [Ch1] or [BCST]). (See also the proof of Lemma 3.1 in Sect. 4 for an explicit formula for $d\Phi_{\sigma_0}$.)

Set $L = L_{x^{(0)}}^{(X)}$ and $H = L_{z^{(0)}}$, and for any $u \in T_{x^{(0)}}X$, consider the vectors

$$v(u) = (u, Lu) \in E^u(\sigma_0) \quad , \quad w(u) = d\Phi(\sigma_0) \cdot v(u) \in E^s(\sigma_0) .$$

It is easy to see that

$$(3.5) \quad \|v(u)\| \leq \sqrt{1 + C^2} \|u\| .$$

The following lemma is the main technical ingredient in the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 6.2. Its proof is given in Sect. 4 below.

LEMMA 3.1. *For any $u, u' \in T_{x^{(0)}}X$ we have $d\alpha(v(u), w(u')) = \langle u, Pu' \rangle$, where the linear operator P is given by $P = 2H + 2L + 2\lambda(HL + LH + L^2 + \lambda LHL)$. Consequently, if $\kappa > 0$ is the*

minimal principal curvature at a point on ∂K and ϵ and λ are chosen sufficiently small, then P is positive definite, $\langle u, Pu \rangle \geq \kappa \|u\|^2$, and therefore $|d\alpha(v(u), w(u))| \geq \kappa \|u\|^2$ for all $u \in T_{x(0)}X$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Take $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and then λ with (3.1) small enough so that the operator P in Lemma 3.1 is positive definite, where σ_0 is chosen as above. (Notice that H and L are uniformly bounded from below and above regardless of the choice of the point σ_0 .) More precisely, as stated in Lemma 3.1, if $\kappa > 0$ is the minimal principal curvature at a point on ∂K , we can choose $0 < \epsilon < \lambda$ so small that $\langle u, Pu \rangle \geq \kappa \|u\|^2$ for any $u \in T_{x(0)}X$.

Set $z_0 = \sigma_0$ and let $b \in \widehat{E}_\Lambda^u(z_0)$, $\|b\| = 1$. Then $b = v(u)$ for some $u \in T_{x(0)}X$. Moreover, by (3.3), $w(u) = d\Phi(\sigma_0) \cdot v(u) \in \widehat{E}_\Lambda^s(z_0)$, and so $a = w(u)/\|w(u)\|$ is a unit vector in $\widehat{E}_\Lambda^s(z_0)$. By Lemma 3.1,

$$|d\alpha(a, b)| = \frac{1}{\|w(u)\|} |d\alpha(v(u), w(u))| \geq \frac{\kappa \|u\|^2}{\|w(u)\|} \geq \frac{\kappa \|u\|^2}{C \|v(u)\|} = \frac{\kappa \|u\|^2}{C}.$$

On the other hand (3.5) implies $1 = \|b\| = \|v(u)\| \leq \sqrt{1+C^2} \|u\|$, so $|d\alpha(a, b)| \geq \frac{\kappa}{C(1+C^2)} \cdot \blacksquare$

As a consequence of Lemma 3.1 one can also derive the following which however we do not need in this paper.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *For every $z \in \Lambda$ and every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\tilde{z} \in \Lambda \cap W_\delta^u(z)$ such that for any non-zero tangent vector $b \in E^u(\tilde{z})$ to Λ there exists a tangent vector $a \in E^s(\tilde{z})$ to Λ with $d\alpha(a, b) \neq 0$.*

4 Proof of Lemma 3.1

We will use the notation from Sect. 3. Recall that the standard symplectic form $d\alpha$ has the form

$$d\alpha((u, \tilde{u}), (p, \tilde{p})) = -\langle u, \tilde{p} \rangle + \langle \tilde{u}, p \rangle,$$

where $(u, \tilde{u}), (p, \tilde{p}) \in T^*(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Given $u, u' \in T_{x(0)}X$, let $v(u) = (u, \tilde{u}) \in E^u(\sigma)$, $v(u') = (u', \tilde{u}') \in E^u(\sigma)$ and $w(u') = d\Phi_{\sigma_0}(v(u')) = (p, \tilde{p})$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} p \\ \tilde{p} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x g(\sigma) & \partial_\xi g(\sigma) \\ -\partial_x \eta(\sigma) & -\partial_\xi \eta(\sigma) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u' \\ \tilde{u}' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x g(\sigma) u' + \partial_\xi g(\sigma) \tilde{u}' \\ -\partial_x \eta(\sigma) u' - \partial_\xi \eta(\sigma) \tilde{u}' \end{pmatrix},$$

and so

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} d\alpha(v(u), w(u')) &= \langle u, \partial_x \eta(\sigma) u' \rangle + \langle u, \partial_\xi \eta(\sigma) \tilde{u}' \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \tilde{u}, \partial_x g(\sigma) u' \rangle + \langle \tilde{u}, \partial_\xi g(\sigma) \tilde{u}' \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

One needs the derivatives of g and η . Differentiating (3.4) gives

$$(4.2) \quad \nabla_x t(\sigma_0) = \nabla f(z^{(0)}) = -\xi^{(0)}, \quad \nabla_\xi t(\sigma_0) = \lambda \nabla f(z^{(0)}) = -\lambda \xi^{(0)}.$$

Moreover, $z = x + t\xi$ implies

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial x_j}(x, \xi) = \delta_{j\ell} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_j}(x, \xi) \xi_\ell, \quad \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial \xi_j}(x, \xi) = t \delta_{j\ell} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial \xi_j}(x, \xi) \xi_\ell.$$

Next, we have $g(x, \xi) = z + (2\lambda - t)\eta = x + 2\lambda\xi - 2(2\lambda - t)\langle \xi, \nabla f(z) \rangle \nabla f(z)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_j}(x, \xi) &= \delta_{ij} + 2\frac{\partial t}{\partial x_j}(x, \xi) \langle \xi, \nabla f(z) \rangle \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z) - 2(2\lambda - t) \left(\sum_{k, \ell=1}^n \xi_k \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(z) \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial x_j} \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z) \\ &\quad - 2(2\lambda - t) \langle \xi, \nabla f(z) \rangle \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_\ell}(z) \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial x_j}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial \xi_j}(x, \xi) &= 2\lambda \delta_{ij} + 2\frac{\partial t}{\partial \xi_j}(x, \xi) \langle \xi, \nabla f(z) \rangle \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z) - 2(2\lambda - t) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(z) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z) \\ &\quad - 2(2\lambda - t) \left(\sum_{k, \ell=1}^n \xi_k \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(z) \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial \xi_j} \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z) - 2(2\lambda - t) \langle \xi, \nabla f(z) \rangle \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_\ell}(z) \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial \xi_j}, \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial x_j}(x, \xi) = -2 \left(\sum_{k, \ell=1}^n \xi_k \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(z) \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial x_j} \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z) - 2 \langle \xi, \nabla f(z) \rangle \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_\ell}(z) \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial x_j},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial \xi_j}(x, \xi) &= \delta_{ij} - 2 \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(z) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z) - 2 \left(\sum_{k, \ell=1}^n \xi_k \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(z) \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial \xi_j} \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z) \\ &\quad - 2 \langle \xi, \nabla f(z) \rangle \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_\ell}(z) \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial \xi_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for $v = (u, \tilde{u}) \in E^u(\sigma_0)$ we have $u, \tilde{u} \perp \xi_0$. Therefore (4.2) imply $\langle \nabla_x t(\sigma_0), u \rangle = \langle \nabla_\xi t(\sigma_0), u \rangle = 0$, and the same holds with u replaced by $\tilde{u}$. This and (4.3) give

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial x_j}(\sigma_0) u_j = u_\ell \quad , \quad \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial z_\ell}{\partial \xi_j}(\sigma_0) u_j = \lambda u_\ell$$

for any $u \in T_{x(0)}X$. Using these, $t(\sigma_0) = \lambda$, the above formulae and the Hessian matrix

$$H' = \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(z^{(0)}) \right)_{k, \ell=1}^n, \text{ one gets :}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_j}(\sigma_0) u'_j &= u'_i - 2\lambda \left(\sum_{k, \ell=1}^n \xi_k^{(0)} u'_\ell \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(z^{(0)}) \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z^{(0)}) + 2\lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^n u'_\ell \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_\ell}(z^{(0)}) \\ &= u'_i - 2\lambda \langle u', H' \xi^{(0)} \rangle \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z^{(0)}) + 2\lambda (H' u')_i = u'_i + 2\lambda (H' u')_i, \end{aligned}$$

where $(H' u')_i$ is the i th coordinate of the (column) vector $H' u'$. Here we used the fact that $\xi^{(0)} = -\nabla f(z^{(0)})$ and $H' \nabla f(z^{(0)}) = 0$, since $\|\nabla f\| = 1$ near ∂K . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial \xi_j}(\sigma_0) \tilde{u}'_j &= 2\lambda \tilde{u}'_i - 2\lambda^2 \left(\sum_{k, \ell=1}^n \xi_k^{(0)} \tilde{u}'_\ell \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(z^{(0)}) \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z^{(0)}) \\ &\quad + 2\lambda^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^n \tilde{u}'_\ell \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_\ell}(z^{(0)}) = 2\lambda \tilde{u}'_i + 2\lambda^2 (H' \tilde{u}')_i, \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial x_j}(\sigma_0) u'_j = -2 \left(\sum_{k,\ell=1}^n \xi_k^{(0)} u'_\ell \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(z^{(0)}) \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z^{(0)}) + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^n u'_\ell \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_\ell}(z^{(0)}) = 2(H'u')_i ,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial \xi_j}(\sigma_0) \tilde{u}'_j &= \tilde{u}'_i - 2\lambda \left(\sum_{k,\ell=1}^n \xi_k^{(0)} \tilde{u}'_\ell \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(z^{(0)}) \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(z^{(0)}) + 2\lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^n \tilde{u}'_\ell \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_\ell}(z^{(0)}) \\ &= \tilde{u}'_i + 2\lambda (H'\tilde{u}')_i . \end{aligned}$$

The last four formulae imply $\langle u, \partial_x \eta(\sigma_0) u' \rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^n u_i u'_j \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial x_j}(\sigma_0) = 2\langle u, H'u' \rangle$, and similarly $\langle u, \partial_\xi \eta(\sigma_0) \tilde{u}' \rangle = \langle u, \tilde{u}' \rangle + 2\lambda \langle u, H'\tilde{u}' \rangle$, $\langle \tilde{u}, \partial_x g(\sigma_0) u' \rangle = \langle \tilde{u}, u' \rangle + 2\lambda \langle \tilde{u}, H'u' \rangle$, and $\langle \tilde{u}, \partial_\xi g(\sigma_0) \tilde{u}' \rangle = 2\lambda \langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{u}' \rangle + 2\lambda^2 \langle \tilde{u}, H'\tilde{u}' \rangle$. Combining these with (4.1), one gets

$$d\alpha(v(u), w(u')) = 2\langle u, H'u' \rangle + \langle u, \tilde{u}' \rangle + 2\lambda \langle u, H'\tilde{u}' \rangle + \langle \tilde{u}, u' \rangle + 2\lambda \langle \tilde{u}, H'u' \rangle + 2\lambda \langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{u}' \rangle + 2\lambda^2 \langle \tilde{u}, H'\tilde{u}' \rangle .$$

Using $\tilde{u} = L(u)$, $\tilde{u}' = L(u')$ and the fact that $H'u = Hu$ for all $u \in T_{x(0)}X$, it now follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d\alpha(v(u), w(u')) &= 2\langle u, Hu' \rangle + \langle u, Lu' \rangle + 2\lambda \langle u, HLu' \rangle + \langle Lu, u' \rangle + 2\lambda \langle Lu, Hu' \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\lambda \langle Lu, Lu' \rangle + 2\lambda^2 \langle Lu, HLu' \rangle = \langle u, Pu' \rangle , \end{aligned}$$

where $P = 2H + 2L + 2\lambda(HL + LH + L^2 + \lambda LHL)$. ■

5 Pinched open billiard flows

In this section we describe some open billiard flows in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 3$) that satisfy the pinching condition (P). (Clearly open billiards in $\mathbb{R}^2$ always satisfy this condition.) As one can see below, the estimates we use are rather crude, so one would expect that with more sophisticated methods larger classes of open billiard flows could be shown to satisfy the condition (P).

First, we derive a formula which is useful in getting estimates for $\|d\phi_t(x) \cdot u\|$ ($u \in E^u(x)$, $x \in \Lambda$), both from above and below. From the arguments in this section one can also derive a representation for the Jacobi fields along a billiard trajectory.

In what follows we use the notation from the beginning of Sect. 3. Here **we assume that the boundary ∂K is at least C^3 smooth.**

Fix for a moment a point $x_0 = (q_0, v_0) \in \Lambda_\epsilon$. If $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, then $W_\epsilon^u(x_0)$ has the form (cf. [Si1],[Si2]) $W_\epsilon^u(x_0) = \{(x, \nu_X(x)) : x \in X\}$ for some smooth hypersurface X in $\mathbb{R}^n$ containing the point q_0 such that X is strictly convex with respect to the unit normal field ν_X . Denote by $B_x : T_q X \rightarrow T_q X$ the *curvature operator (second fundamental form)* of X at $q \in X$. Then B_x is positive definite with respect to the normal field ν_X ([Si2]).

Given a point $q \in X$, let $\gamma(x)$ be the *forward billiard trajectory* generated by $x = (q, \nu_X(q))$. Let $q_1(x), q_2(x), \dots$ be the reflection points of this trajectory and let $\xi_j(x) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ be the *reflected direction* of $\gamma(x)$ at $q_j(x)$. Set $q_0(x) = q$, $t_0(x) = 0$ and denote by $t_1(x), t_2(x), \dots$ the times of the consecutive reflections of the trajectory $\gamma(x)$ at ∂K . Then $t_j(x) = d_0(x) + d_1(x) + \dots + d_{j-1}(x)$, where $d_j(x) = \|q_{j+1}(x) - q_j(x)\|$, $1 \leq j$. Given $t \geq 0$, denote by $u_t(q)$ the *shift* of q along the trajectory $\gamma(x)$ after time t . Set $X_t = \{u_t(q) : q \in X\}$. When $u_t(q)$ is not a reflection point of $\gamma(x)$, then locally near $u_t(q)$, X_t is a smooth convex $(n-1)$ -dimensional surface in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with "outward" unit normal given by the direction $v_t(q)$ of $\gamma(x)$ at $u_t(q)$ (cf. [Si2]).

Fix for a moment $t > 0$ such that $t_m(x_0) < t < t_{m+1}(x_0)$ for some $m \geq 1$, and assume that $q(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq a$, is a C^3 curve on X with $q(0) = q_0$ such that for every $s \in [0, a]$ we have $t_m(x(s)) < t < t_{m+1}(x(s))$, where $x(s) = (q(s), \nu_X(q(s)))$. Assume also that $a > 0$ is so small

that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ the reflection points $q_j(s) = q_j(x(s))$ belong to the same boundary component ∂K_{i_j} for every $s \in [0, a]$.

We will now estimate $\|d\phi_t(x_0) \cdot \xi_0\|$, where $\xi_0 = \dot{q}(0) \in T_{q_0}X$.

Clearly $\phi_t(x(s)) = (p(s), v_m(x(s)))$, where $p(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq a$, is a C^3 curve on X_t . For brevity denote by $\gamma(s)$ the *forward billiard trajectory* generated by $(q(s), \nu(q(s)))$ and set $q_0(s) = q(s)$. Let $\xi_j(s) \in S^{n-1}$ be the *reflected direction* of $\gamma(s)$ at $q_j(s)$ and let $\varphi_j(s)$ be the *angle* between $\xi_j(s)$ and the outward unit normal $\nu(q_j(s))$ of ∂K at $q_j(s)$. Let $\phi_t(x(s)) = (u_t(s), v_t(s))$, and let $t_j(s) = t_j(x(s))$ be the times of the consecutive reflections of the trajectory $\gamma(s)$ at ∂K . Set $d_j(s) = d_j(x(s)) = \|q_{j+1}(s) - q_j(s)\|$ ($0 \leq j \leq m-1$), $t_0(s) = 0$, $t_{m+1}(s) = t$ and $d_m(s) = t - t_m(s)$. Denote by $k_t(s)$ the *normal curvature* of X_t at $u_t(s)$ in the direction of $\frac{d}{ds}u_t(s)$.

Next, let $k_0(s)$ be the *normal curvature* of X at $q(s)$ in the direction of $\dot{q}(s)$, and for $j > 0$ let $k_j(s) > 0$ be the *normal curvature* of $X_{t_j(s)} = \lim_{t \searrow t_j(s)} X_t$ at $q_j(s)$ in the direction $\hat{u}_j(s)$ ($\|\hat{u}_j(s)\| = 1$) of $\lim_{t \searrow t_j(s)} \frac{d}{ds'}(u_t(s'))|_{s'=s}$. For $j \geq 0$ let

$$B_j(s) : T_{q_j(s)}(X_{t_j(s)}) \longrightarrow T_{q_j(s)}(X_{t_j(s)})$$

be the *curvature operator* (second fundamental form) of $X_{t_j(s)}$ at $q_j(s)$, and define $\ell_j(s) > 0$ by

$$(5.1) \quad [1 + d_j(s)\ell_j(s)]^2 = 1 + 2d_j(s)k_j(s) + (d_j(s))^2 \|B_j(s)\hat{u}_j(s)\|^2.$$

Finally, set

$$(5.2) \quad \delta_j(s) = \frac{1}{1 + d_j(s)\ell_j(s)} \quad , \quad 0 \leq j \leq m.$$

PROPOSITION 5.1. *For all $s \in [0, a]$ we have*

$$(5.3) \quad \|\dot{q}_0(s)\| = \|\dot{p}(s)\| \delta_0(s) \delta_1(s) \dots \delta_m(s).$$

As we mentioned in the Introduction, the above formula can be easily derived from the more general study of the evolution of unstable fronts in multidimensional dispersing billiards in [BCST] (see Section 5 there). Apart from that, one could prove (5.3) by using a simple modification of the argument in the Appendix of [St2] dealing with the two-dimensional case. We omit the details.

We will now use Proposition 5.1 to prove Proposition 1.2.

In the notation above, let $q_j = q_j(x)$ be the reflection points of the billiard trajectory $\gamma(x)$ for some $x = (q, \nu_X(q))$, with $q \in X$, and let $t_j = t_j(x)$ and $d_j = d_j(x)$. Consider the curvature operator $B_j = B_{q_j} : \Pi_j = T_{q_j}(X_{t_j}) \longrightarrow \Pi_j$, and let $S_j : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be the *symmetry* with respect to the *tangent space* $\mathcal{T}_j = T_{q_j}(\partial K)$; notice that $S_j(\Pi_{j-1}) = \Pi_j$. Let $N_j : \mathcal{T}_j \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_j$ be the *curvature operator* (second fundamental form) of ∂K at q_j .

Notice that Π_j is the hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^n$ passing through q_j and orthogonal to $\xi_j = v_{t_j(x)}(x)$; it will be identified with the $(n-1)$ -dimensional vector subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ orthogonal to ξ_j .

Before going on we need to recall the representation of the operator B_j due to Sinai [Si2] (cf. also Chernov [Ch1]). Introduce the linear maps $V_j : \Pi_j \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_j$, $V_j^* : \mathcal{T}_j \longrightarrow \Pi_j$ where V_j is (the restriction to Π_j of) the projection to $\mathcal{T}_j$ along the vector ξ_j , while V_j^* is the projection to Π_j along the normal vector $\nu_j = \nu(q_j)$. (Considering $V_j : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_j$ and $V_j^* : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \Pi_j$, V_j^* is the self-adjoint of V_j .) Let φ_j be the *angle* between ν_j and ξ_j . Then ([Si2])

$$(5.4) \quad B_j = S_j B_j^- S_j + 2 \cos \varphi_j V_j^* N_j V_j$$

for $1 \leq j \leq m$, $B_j^- = B_{j-1} (I + d_{j-1} B_{j-1})^{-1}$, and $B_{m+1} = B_m (I + t' B_m)^{-1}$, where $t' = t - t_m \geq \epsilon$.

Let $\mu_j(x_0) \leq \lambda_j(x_0)$ be the minimal and the maximal eigenvalues of the operator B_j . If λ is an eigenvalue of B_{j-1} , then $\lambda/(1 + d_{j-1}\lambda)$ is an eigenvalue of B_j^- , and $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda d_{j-1}} = \frac{1}{1/\lambda + d_{j-1}} < \frac{1}{d_0}$. Next, a simple calculation shows that the spectrum of the operator $V_j^* N_j V_j$ lies in the interval $[\kappa_{\min}, \frac{\kappa_{\max}}{\cos^2 \varphi_j}]$. Thus, using (5.4) we get

$$(5.5) \quad \mu_0 \leq 2 \cos \varphi_j \kappa_{\min} \leq \mu_j(x_0) \leq \lambda_j(x_0) \leq \frac{1}{d_0} + \frac{2\kappa_{\max}}{\cos \varphi_j} \leq \lambda_0 ,$$

where μ_0 and λ_0 are as in Sect. 1.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. Before we continue, notice that there exist global constants $0 < c_1 < c_2$ such that $c_1 \|\xi\| \leq \|u\| \leq c_2 \|\xi\|$ for any $u = (\xi, \eta) \in E^u(x)$, $x \in \Lambda$ (see formula (3.5) above).

Assume that (1.1) holds. Fix an arbitrary $x_0 = (q_0, v_0) \in \Lambda_\epsilon$ and $t > 0$. We will now use the notation from the beginning of this section.

To estimate $\|d\phi_t(x_0) \cdot u\|$ for a given unit vector $u = (\xi, \eta) \in E^u(x_0)$, consider a C^1 curve $q(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq a$, on $X = \text{pr}_1(W_\epsilon^u(x_0))$ with $q(0) = q_0$ and $\dot{q}(0) = \xi$, and define $q_j(s)$, $j = 1, \dots, m$ and $p(s)$ as in the beginning of this section. Then $p(s) = \text{pr}_1(d\phi_t(x(s)))$, so $c_1 \|\dot{p}(0)\| \leq \|d\phi_t(x_0) \cdot u\| \leq c_2 \|\dot{p}(0)\|$. Using this and Proposition 5.1, we get

$$(5.6) \quad \frac{c_1 \|u\|}{c_2 \delta_1(0) \delta_2(0) \dots \delta_m(0)} \leq \|d\phi_t(x_0) \cdot u\| \leq \frac{c_2 \|u\|}{c_1 \delta_1(0) \delta_2(0) \dots \delta_m(0)} .$$

Recall that each δ_j is given by (5.2) and (5.1), so if $0 < \mu_j(x_0) \leq \lambda_j(x_0)$ are the minimal and maximal eigenvalues of the operator $B_j(0)$, then

$$(1 + d_j(0) \ell_j(0))^2 \leq 1 + 2d_j(0) \lambda_j + d_j^2(0) \lambda_j^2 = (1 + d_j(0) \lambda_j(x_0))^2 ,$$

so $\ell_j(0) \leq \lambda_j(x_0)$. Similarly, $\mu_j(x_0) \leq \ell_j(0)$. Moreover, it follows from (5.5) that $\mu_0 \leq \mu_j(x_0)$ and $\lambda_j(x_0) \leq \lambda_0$ for all $j \geq 1$ and all $x_0 \in \Lambda$.

Assuming $\|u\| = 1$ and recalling that $d_j(x_0) = d_j(0)$ and $t > d_1(x_0) + \dots + d_m(x_0)$, (5.6) and (5.2) give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t} \ln \|d\phi_t(x_0) \cdot u\| &\leq \frac{\ln(c_2/c_1)}{t} + \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^m \ln(1 + d_j(x_0) \lambda_j(x_0)) \\ &\leq \frac{\ln(c_2/c_1)}{t} + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m \ln(1 + (d_0 + a) \lambda_0)}{d_1(x_0) + \dots + d_m(x_0)} \\ &\leq \frac{\ln(c_2/c_1)}{t} + \frac{m \ln(1 + (d_0 + a) \lambda_0)}{m d_0} \\ &\leq \frac{\ln(c_2/c_1)}{t} + \frac{\ln(1 + (d_0 + a) \lambda_0)}{d_0} = \frac{\ln(c_2/c_1)}{t} + \beta_0 , \end{aligned}$$

so $\|d\phi_t(x_0) \cdot u\| \leq (c_2/c_1) e^{t\beta_0}$ for all $t > 0$.

In a similar way, using (5.6) one derives that $\|d\phi_t(x_0) \cdot u\| \geq c' (c_1/c_2) e^{t\alpha_0}$ for $t > 0$, where $\alpha_0 = \frac{\ln(1+d_0\mu_0)}{d_0+a}$ and $c' > 0$ is another global constant. Finally, notice that (1.1) implies $2\alpha_0 \geq \beta_0 + \alpha$ for some global constant $\alpha > 0$. Hence the condition (P) is satisfied. ■

6 Dolgopyat type estimates for pinched open billiard flows

Let $\phi_t : M \rightarrow M$ be a C^1 flow on complete (not necessarily compact) Riemann manifold M , and let Λ be a basic set for ϕ_t . It follows from the hyperbolicity of Λ that if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $x, y \in \Lambda$ and $d(x, y) < \delta$, then $W_\epsilon^s(x)$ and $\phi_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon]}(W_\epsilon^u(y))$ intersect at exactly one point $[x, y] \in \Lambda$ (cf. [KH]). That is, there exists a unique $t \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$ such that $\phi_t([x, y]) \in W_\epsilon^u(y)$.

Let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a Markov family for ϕ_t over Λ consisting of rectangles $R_i = [U_i, S_i]$, where U_i (resp. S_i) are (admissible) subsets of $W_\epsilon^u(z_i) \cap \Lambda$ (resp. $W_\epsilon^s(z_i) \cap \Lambda$) for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $z_i \in \Lambda$ (cf. e.g. [PP] for details; see also [D]). The *first return time function* $\tau : R = \cup_{i=1}^k R_i \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and the standard Poincaré map $\mathcal{P} : R \rightarrow R$ are Lipschitz when restricted to an appropriate large subset of R . Set $U = \cup_{i=1}^k U_i$ and define the *shift map* $\sigma : U \rightarrow U$ by $\sigma = p \circ \mathcal{P}$, where $p : R \rightarrow U$ is the projection along the leaves of local stable manifolds. Let $\hat{U}$ be the set of all $u \in U$ whose orbits do not have common points with the boundary of R (in Λ). Given a Lipschitz function (or map) on $\hat{U}$, we will identify it with its (unique) Lipschitz extension to U . Assuming that the local stable and unstable laminations over Λ are Lipschitz, the map σ is *essentially Lipschitz* on U in the sense that there exists a constant $L > 0$ such that if $x, y \in U_i \cap \sigma^{-1}(U_j)$ for some i, j , then $d(\sigma(x), \sigma(y)) \leq L d(x, y)$. The same applies to $\tau : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Given a Lipschitz real-valued function f on $\hat{U}$, set $g = g_f = f - P\tau$, where $P = P_f \in \mathbb{R}$ is the unique number such that the topological pressure $\text{Pr}_\sigma(g)$ of g with respect to σ is zero (cf. e.g. [PP]). For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, one defines the *Ruelle operator* $L_{g-(a+ib)\tau} : C^{\text{Lip}}(\hat{U}) \rightarrow C^{\text{Lip}}(\hat{U})$ in the usual way (cf. e.g. [PP] or [D]), where $C^{\text{Lip}}(\hat{U})$ is the space of Lipschitz functions $g : \hat{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. By $\text{Lip}(g)$ we denote the Lipschitz constant of g and by $\|g\|_0$ the *standard sup norm* of g on $\hat{U}$.

We will say that the *Ruelle transfer operators related to the function f on U are eventually contracting* if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist constants $0 < \rho < 1$, $a_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that if $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ are such that $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq 1/a_0$, then for every integer $m > 0$ and every $h \in C^{\text{Lip}}(\hat{U})$ we have

$$\|L_{f-(P_f+a+ib)\tau}^m h\|_{\text{Lip}, b} \leq C \rho^m |b|^\epsilon \|h\|_{\text{Lip}, b},$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Lip}, b}$ on $C^{\text{Lip}}(\hat{U})$ is defined by $\|h\|_{\text{Lip}, b} = \|h\|_0 + \frac{\text{Lip}(h)}{|b|}$. This implies in particular that the spectral radius of $L_{f-(P_f+a+ib)\tau}$ in $C^{\text{Lip}}(\hat{U})$ does not exceed ρ .

Next, assume that ϕ_t is a C^2 contact flow on M with a C^2 invariant contact form ω . The following condition says that $d\omega$ is in some sense non-degenerate on Λ near some of its points:

(ND): *There exist $z_0 \in \Lambda$, $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\mu_0 > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$, any $\hat{z} \in \Lambda \cap W_\delta^u(z_0)$ and any unit vector $b \in E^u(\hat{z})$ tangent to Λ at $\hat{z}$ there exist $\tilde{z} \in \Lambda \cap W_\delta^u(\hat{z})$, $\tilde{y} \in W_\delta^s(\tilde{z})$ and a unit vector $a \in E^s(\tilde{y})$ tangent to Λ at $\tilde{y}$ with*

$$(6.1) \quad |d\omega_{\tilde{z}}(a_{\tilde{z}}, b_{\tilde{z}})| \geq \mu_0$$

where $b_{\tilde{z}}$ is the parallel translate of b along the geodesic in $W_{\delta_0}^u(\tilde{z})$ from $\hat{z}$ to $\tilde{z}$, while $a_{\tilde{z}}$ is the parallel translate of a along the geodesic in $W_{\delta_0}^s(\tilde{z})$ from $\tilde{y}$ to $\tilde{z}$.

Remark 3. In fact, it is clear from the proof of Proposition 6.1 in [St3] that in (ND) the ‘parallel translation’ in the definition of the vector $b_{\tilde{z}}$ can be replaced by any other uniformly continuous (linear) operator $P_{\hat{z}, \tilde{z}} : E^u(\hat{z}) \rightarrow E^u(\tilde{z})$ ($\hat{z}, \tilde{z} \in \Lambda \cap W_{\delta_0}^u(z_0)$). E.g. using a local coordinate system to ‘identify’ $E^u(\hat{z})$ and $E^u(\tilde{z})$ would be good enough. The same applies to the ‘parallel translation’ in the definition of the vector $a_{\tilde{z}}$. In the case of the open billiard considered in this paper, (6.1) can be replaced simply by $|d\alpha(a, b)| \geq \mu_0$.

As an immediate consequence of the main result² in [St3] (see also Sect. 6 there) one gets the following:

THEOREM 6.1.([St3]) *Let $\phi_t : M \rightarrow M$ be a C^2 contact flow on a C^2 Riemann manifold M and let Λ be a basic set for ϕ_t such that the conditions (P) and (ND) are satisfied for the restriction of the flow on Λ . Then for any Lipschitz real-valued function f on $\widehat{U}$ the Ruelle transfer operators related to f are eventually contracting.*

Notice that for open billiard flows both $W_\epsilon^s(x) \cap \Lambda$ and $W_\epsilon^u(x) \cap \Lambda$ are Cantor sets, i.e. they are infinite compact totally disconnected sets without isolated points. In this particular case we can always choose the Markov family $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^k$ so that the boundary (in Λ) of each rectangle R_i is empty and therefore $U = \widehat{U}$.

Next, assume that K is as in Sect. 1. Let ϕ_t be the open billiard flow in the exterior of K and let Λ be its non-wandering set.

The following consequence of Lemma 3.1 shows that under some regularity condition, the billiard flow satisfies the condition (ND) on Λ .

PROPOSITION 6.2. *Assume that the map $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^u(x)$ is C^1 . Then there exist $z_0 \in \Lambda$, $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\mu_0 > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$, any $z \in \Lambda \cap W_\delta^u(z_0)$ and any unit vector $b \in E^u(z)$ tangent to Λ at z there exist $y \in W_\delta^s(z)$ and a unit vector $a \in E^s(y)$ tangent to Λ at y with $|d\alpha(a_z, b)| \geq \mu_0$, where a_z is the parallel translate of a along the geodesic in $W_{\delta_0}^s(s)$ from y to z .*

Proof of Proposition 6.2. Notice that the standard symplectic form $d\alpha$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ satisfies

$$|d\alpha(\xi, \eta)| \leq \|\xi\| \|\eta\| \quad , \quad \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} ,$$

where we use the standard norm $\|\cdot\|$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

Assume that the map $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^u(x)$ is C^1 ; then the map $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^s(x)$ is C^1 , as well. Fix σ_0 as in Sect. 3, set $z_0 = \sigma_0$, and choosing $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $\delta'_0 \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ sufficiently small, define the map

$$\Phi : W_{\delta'_0}^u(z_0) \rightarrow W_{\epsilon_0}^s(z_0)$$

as in Sect. 3. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that there exists a constant $\mu_1 > 0$ (e.g. take $\mu_1 = \kappa/\sqrt{1+C^2}$) such that $|d\alpha(d\Phi(z_0) \cdot b, b)| \geq \mu_1$ for all unit vectors $b \in E^u(z_0)$. Take $\delta'_0 > 0$ so small that

$$(6.2) \quad |d\alpha(d\Phi(z) \cdot b, b)| \geq \frac{\mu_1}{2} \quad , \quad z \in W_{\delta'_0}^u(z_0) , \quad b \in E^u(z) , \quad \|b\| = 1 .$$

Further restrictions on δ'_0 will be imposed later.

Next, assuming $\delta'_0 \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ is sufficiently small, for any $x \in \Lambda$ and $y \in \Lambda \cap W_{\delta'_0}^u(x)$ the local holonomy map $\mathcal{H}_{x,y}^u : \Lambda \cap W_{\delta'_0}^s(x) \rightarrow \Lambda \cap W_{\epsilon_0}^s(y)$ along unstable laminations is well-defined and uniformly Hölder continuous (see e.g. [HPS] or [PSW]). Recall that the map $\mathcal{H}_{x,y}^u$ is defined as follows. Given $x' \in \Lambda \cap W_{\delta'_0}^s(x)$, there exist a unique $y' \in W_{\epsilon_0}^s(y)$ such that $\phi_t(y') \in W_{\epsilon_0}^u(x')$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $|t| \leq \epsilon_0$. Then we set $\mathcal{H}_{x,y}^u(x') = y'$. Under the additional condition that the unstable laminations are C^1 , the maps $\mathcal{H}_{x,y}^u$ are C^1 as well (see e.g. Fact (2) on p. 647 in [Ha1]). That is, for each $x' \in \Lambda \cap W_{\delta'_0}^s(x)$ the map $\mathcal{H}_{x,y}^u$ has a linearization $L_{x,y}^u(x') : E^s(x') \rightarrow E^s(y')$ at $x' \in \Lambda \cap W_{\delta'_0}^s(x)$ and $\|L_{x,y}^u(x')\| \leq C_1$ for some constant $C_1 > 0$ independent of x, y and x' . Notice that $L_{x,y}^u(x')$ preserves the sets of tangent vectors to Λ , namely if $\xi \in E^s(x') \setminus \{0\}$ is tangent to Λ at x' , then $L_{x,y}^u(x') \cdot \xi$ is tangent to Λ at y' .

²In fact, the main result in [St3] is much more general, however we are not going to discuss it here.

Since the map $L_{z_0,z}^u(x)$ depends continuously on $z \in W_{\delta'_0}^u(z_0) \cap \Lambda$ and $x \in W_{\delta'_0}^s(z_0) \cap \Lambda$ and $L_{z_0,z_0}^u(z_0) = I$ (the identity operator), we can take $\delta'_0 > 0$ so small that

$$(6.3) \quad \|L_{z_0,z}^u(x) - I\| \leq \frac{\mu_1}{4}$$

for all $z \in \Lambda \cap W_{\delta'_0}^u(z_0)$ and $x \in \Lambda \cap W_{\delta'_0}^s(z_0)$. We will assume $\delta'_0 > 0$ is chosen so small that for all $z \in W_{\delta'_0}^u(z_0) \cap \Lambda$, $y \in W_{\delta'_0}^s(z) \cap \Lambda$ and unit vectors $a \in E^s(y)$ we have $\|a - a_z\| \leq \frac{\mu_1}{8CC_1}$, where a_z is the parallel translate of a along the geodesic on $W_{\delta'_0}^s(y)$ from y to z .

Finally, take $\delta_0 \in (0, \delta'_0]$ so small that for any $z \in W_{\delta_0}^u(z_0) \cap \Lambda$ we have $d(\Phi(z), z_0) < \delta'_0$ and $d(z, \mathcal{H}_{z_0,z}^u(\Phi(z))) < \delta'_0$, where d is the standard distance in $T(\mathbb{R}^n) = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

Now consider an arbitrary $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ and an arbitrary $z \in W_{\delta}^u(z_0) \cap \Lambda$. Let $b \in E^u(z)$ be a unit vector tangent to Λ at z . Set $x = \Phi(z)$, $a' = d\Phi(z) \cdot b$ and $y = \mathcal{H}_{z_0,z}^u(x)$. Then $x \in W_{\delta'_0}^s(z_0) \cap \Lambda$, $a' \in E^s(x)$ is a tangent vector to Λ at x (see Sect. 3) and $y \in W_{\delta'_0}^s(z) \cap \Lambda$. Moreover, since $\|b\| = 1$, it follows from $\|d\Phi\| \leq C$ (see Sect. 3) that $\|a'\| \leq C$.

Next, the vector $\tilde{a} = L_{z_0,z}^u(x) \cdot a' \in E^s(y)$ is tangent to Λ at y and by (6.3), $\|\tilde{a} - a'\| \leq \frac{\mu_1}{4}$. Moreover, $\|\tilde{a}\| \leq C_1\|a'\| \leq CC_1$. Hence $a = \frac{\tilde{a}}{\|\tilde{a}\|} \in E^s(y)$ is a unit vector tangent to Λ at y , and using (6.2) and (6.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |d\alpha(a_z, b)| &\geq |d\alpha(a, b)| - |d\alpha(a - a_z, b)| \geq \frac{1}{\|\tilde{a}\|} |d\alpha(\tilde{a}, b)| - \frac{\mu_1}{8CC_1} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{CC_1} [|d\alpha(a', b)| - |d\alpha(\tilde{a} - a', b)|] - \frac{\mu_1}{8CC_1} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{CC_1} \left[|d\alpha(d\Phi(z) \cdot b, b)| - \frac{\mu_1}{4} \right] - \frac{\mu_1}{8CC_1} \geq \frac{\mu_1}{4CC_1} - \frac{\mu_1}{8CC_1} = \mu_0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_0 = \frac{\mu_1}{8CC_1}$. This proves the assertion. ■

From Theorem 6.1 and Proposition 6.2 one derives the following.

THEOREM 6.3. *Assume that the billiard flow $\phi_t : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ satisfies the condition (P) on its non-wandering set Λ . Then for any Lipschitz real-valued function f on U the Ruelle transfer operators related to f are eventually contracting.*

Proof of Theorem 6.3. As mentioned in Sect. 1, the condition (P) implies that the map $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^u(x)$ is C^1 . Then by Proposition 6.2, ϕ_t satisfies the condition (ND) on Λ . Now applying Theorem 6.1 proves the assertion. ■

Results of this kind were first established by Dolgopyat ([D]) for some Anosov flows (i.e. $\Lambda = M$, a compact Riemann manifold). His results apply to geodesic flows on any compact surface (for any f), and to transitive Anosov flows on compact Riemann manifolds with C^1 jointly non-integrable local stable and unstable foliations for the Sinai-Bowen-Ruelle potential $f = \log \det(d\phi_\tau)|_{E^u}$.

As one can see, Theorems 6.1 and 6.3 work for any potential. Theorem 6.3 generalizes the result in [St2] which deals with open billiard flows in the plane.

It should be mentioned that Dolgopyat type estimates for pinched open billiard flows have already been used in [PS1], [PS2] and [PS3] to obtain some rather non-trivial results. The main result in [PS1] provides existence of an analytic continuations of the cut-off resolvent of the Dirichlet Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ in a horizontal strip above the level of absolute convergence and

polynomial estimates for the norm of the cut-off resolvent in such a domain. The Dolgopyat type estimates for the open billiard flow in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ play a significant role in the proof. These estimates are also essential for the proof of the main result in [PS2] which deals with estimates of correlations for pairs of closed billiard trajectories for open billiards. Previous results of this kind were established in [PoS2] for geodesic flows on surfaces of negative curvature. Finally, in a very recent preprint [PS3], using Theorem 6.3 a fine asymptotic was obtained for the number of closed billiard trajectories in Λ with primitive periods lying in exponentially shrinking intervals $(x - e^{-\delta x}, x + e^{-\delta x})$, $\delta > 0$, $x \rightarrow +\infty$.

As in [St3], using Theorem 6.3 and an argument of Pollicott and Sharp [PoS1], we get some rather significant consequences about the *Ruelle zeta function* $\zeta(s) = \prod_{\gamma} (1 - e^{-s\ell(\gamma)})^{-1}$. Here γ runs over the set of primitive closed orbits of $\phi_t : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ and $\ell(\gamma)$ is the least period of γ . Let h_T be the *topological entropy* of ϕ_t on Λ .

COROLLARY 6.4. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 6.3, the zeta function $\zeta(s)$ of the flow $\phi_t : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ has an analytic and non-vanishing continuation in a half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(s) > c_0$ for some $c_0 < h_T$ except for a simple pole at $s = h_T$. Moreover, there exists $c \in (0, h_T)$ such that*

$$\pi(\lambda) = \#\{\gamma : \ell(\gamma) \leq \lambda\} = \operatorname{li}(e^{h_T \lambda}) + O(e^{c\lambda})$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, where $\operatorname{li}(x) = \int_2^x \frac{du}{\log u} \sim \frac{x}{\log x}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

As another consequence of Theorem 6.3 and the procedure described in [D] one gets exponential decay of correlations for the flow $\phi_t : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$.

Given $\alpha > 0$ denote by $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(\Lambda)$ the set of *Hölder continuous functions* with Hölder exponent α and by $\|h\|_\alpha$ the *Hölder constant* of $h \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(\Lambda)$.

COROLLARY 6.5. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 6.3, let F be a Hölder continuous function on Λ and let ν_F be the Gibbs measure determined by F on Λ . Assume in addition that the boundary of K is at least C^5 . Then for every $\alpha > 0$ there exist constants $C = C(\alpha) > 0$ and $c = c(\alpha) > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \int_{\Lambda} A(x) B(\phi_t(x)) d\nu_F(x) - \left(\int_{\Lambda} A(x) d\nu_F(x) \right) \left(\int_{\Lambda} B(x) d\nu_F(x) \right) \right| \leq C e^{-ct} \|A\|_\alpha \|B\|_\alpha$$

for any two functions $A, B \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(\Lambda)$.

One would expect that much stronger results could be established by using the techniques recently developed in [BKL], [L], [BG], [GL], [T] (see the references there, as well). Still, there are not very many results of this kind. In fact, for dimensions higher than two the author is not aware of any other results of this kind concerning billiard flows. What concerns billiards in general, bounds of correlation decay known so far concern mostly the corresponding discrete dynamical system (generated by the billiard ball map from boundary to boundary) – see [BSC], [Y] and [ChZ]. See also [ChZ] and the references there for some related results. Recently, a sub-exponential decay of correlations for Sinai billiards in the plane was established by Chernov ([Ch3]). For open billiard flows in the plane exponential decay of correlations was proved in [St2] (as a consequence of the Dolgopyat type estimates established there).

References

- [BG] V. Baladi and S. Gouëzel. Good Banach spaces for piecewise hyperbolic maps via interpolation. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Analyse non linéaire* **26** (2009), 1453-1481.

- [BCST] P. Bálint, N. Chernov, D. Szász and I.P.Tóth . Geometry of multi-dimensional dispersing billiards. *Asterisque* **286** (2003), 119-150.
- [BKL] M. Blank, G. Keller and C. Liverani. Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius spectrum for Anosov maps. *Nonlinearity* **15** (2002), 1905-1973.
- [B] R. Bowen. Symbolic dynamics for hyperbolic flows. *Amer. J. Math.* **95** (1973), 429-460.
- [BSC] L. Bunimovich, Ya. Sinai, and N. Chernov. Statistical properties of two-dimensional hyperbolic billiards. *Russ. Math. Surveys* **46** (1991), 47-106.
- [Burq] N. Burq. Contrôle de l'équation des plaques en présence d'obstacles strictement convexes. *Mém. Soc. Math. France (N.S.)* No. 55 (1993), 126 pp.
- [Ch1] N. Chernov. Structure of transversal leaves in multidimensional semidispersing billiards. *Funct. Anal. and Appl.* **16** (1982), 35-46.
- [Ch2] N. Chernov. Decay of correlations and dispersing billiards. *J. Stat. Phys.* **94** (1999),
- [Ch3] N. Chernov. A stretched exponential bound on time correlations for billiard flows. *J. Stat. Phys.* **127** (2007), 21-50.
- [ChZ] N. Chernov and H.-K. Zhang. Improved estimates for correlations in billiards. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **277** (2008), 305-321.
- [D] D. Dolgopyat. On decay of correlations in Anosov flows. *Ann. of Math.* **147** (1998), 357-390.
- [GL] S. Gouëzel and G. Liverani. Banach spaces adapted to Anosov systems. *Erg. Th. & Dyn. Sys.* **26** (2006), 189-217.
- [GP] V. Guillemin and A. Polack. *Differential topology*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1974.
- [Ha1] B. Hasselblatt. Regularity of the Anosov splitting and of horospheric foliations. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **14** (1994), 645-666.
- [Ha2] B. Hasselblatt. Regularity of the Anosov splitting II. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **17** (1997), 169-172.
- [HP] M. Hirsch and C. Pugh. Smoothness of horocycle foliations. *J. Diff. Geometry* **10** (1975), 225-238.
- [HPS] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh and M. Shub, *Invariant manifolds*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. **583**, 1977.
- [KB] A. Katok and Burns. Infinitesimal Lyapunov functions, invariant cone families and stochastic properties of smooth dynamical systems. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **14** (1994), 757-785.
- [KH] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt. *Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1995.
- [L] C. Liverani. On contact Anosov flows. *Ann. of Math.* **159** (2004), 1275-1312.
- [M] B. Malgrange. *Ideals of Differentiable Functions*. Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1966.
- [PP] W. Parry and M. Pollicott. Zeta functions and the periodic orbit structure of hyperbolic dynamics. *Astérisque* **187-188**, 1990.
- [PS1] V. Petkov and L. Stoyanov. Analytic continuation of the resolvent of the Laplacian and the dynamical zeta function. *Analysis and PDE* **3** (2010), 427-489.
- [PS2] V. Petkov and L. Stoyanov. Correlations for pairs of closed trajectories in open billiards. *Nonlinearity* **22** (2009), 2657-2679.
- [PS3] V. Petkov and L. Stoyanov. Distribution of periods of closed trajectories in exponentially shrinking intervals, Preprint 2010 (arXiv: math.DS:1008.4308).
- [PoS1] M. Pollicott and R. Sharp. Exponential error terms for growth functions of negatively curved surfaces. *Amer. J. Math.* **120** (1998), 1019-1042.
- [PoS2] M. Pollicott and R. Sharp. Correlations for pairs of closed geodesics. *Invent. Math.* **163** (2006), 1-24.
- [PSW] C. Pugh, M. Shub and A. Wilkinson. Hölder foliations. *Duke Math. J.* **86** (1997), 517-546; Correction: *Duke Math. J.* **105** (2000), 105-106.
- [Si1] Ya. Sinai. Dynamical systems with elastic reflections. *Russian Math. Surveys* **25** (1970), 137-190.
- [Si2] Ya. Sinai. Development of Krylov's ideas. An addendum to: N.S.Krylov "Works on the foundations of statistical physics". Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton 1979, pp. 239-281.
- [SiCh] Ya. Sinai and N. Chernov. Ergodic properties of some systems of 2-dimensional discs and 3-dimensional spheres. *Russ. Math. Surveys* **42** (1987), 181-207.

- [St1] L. Stoyanov. Exponential instability and entropy for a class of dispersing billiards. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **19** (1999), 201-226.
- [St2] L. Stoyanov. Spectrum of the Ruelle operator and exponential of correlation for open billiard flows. *Amer. J. Math.* **123** (2001), 715-759.
- [St3] L. Stoyanov. Spectra of Ruelle transfer operators for Axiom A flows. *Preprint* (arXiv: math.DS:0810.1126).
- [St4] L. Stoyanov. Tangent bundles to regular basic sets in hyperbolic dynamics. *Preprint* (arXiv: math.DS:1009.0102).
- [Y] L.-S. Young. Statistical properties of systems with some hyperbolicity including certain billiards. *Ann. Math.* **147** (1998), 585-650.
- [T] M. Tsujii. Quasi-compactness of transfer operators for contact Anosov flows. *Nonlinearity* **23** (2010), 1495-1545.